

seattle bicycle master plan • • •

Council Transportation Committee

February 12, 2013



Purpose of Briefing



- Status of plan update process
- Draft bicycle network plan map development
 - Identify locations for future bicycle investments
- Summary of comments received on draft map
- Highlight key issues/questions
- Next steps



Context: Council Briefings


Last Council briefing was September 11:

- Summarized first phase of public engagement process
- Presented proposed policy framework
- Discussed performance measures

Work since last briefing focused on preparing draft plan map for public review



BMP Update Roadmap



Council Direction

Council direction on scope of work:

- Incorporate neighborhood greenways
- Incorporate separated facilities (cycle tracks)
- Review NACTO and planning best practices
- Incorporate new facility types into existing network



Draft Network Plan Map Development

Develop updated plan map to identify locations for future bicycle investments (where and what type)

- Principles:
 - Consider land use (destinations and demand rankings)
 - Emphasize network connectivity
 - Improve conditions for bicyclists of all ages and abilities
 - Provide a bicycle facility within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of all households in Seattle



Draft Plan Map Development

Step 1: Data analysis

– Data and inputs:

- 2007 BMP recommendations
- Gap analysis
- Identified opportunities
- Demand/land use destinations
- Topography
- Public input (early input on desired routes)

Arterial Classification

Traffic Volume &
Posted Speed Limit

Destination Density


Neighborhood Greenways
Advocates Input

Public Input

Bicycle System Gaps &
Opportunities


Street Network

Topography



Draft Plan Map Development


Land use: a key focus on connecting people to places they want to go



Draft Plan Map Development

Step 2: Developed proposed network based on data analysis and review by project team

- More qualitative assessment
- Goal to create a connected network throughout the city



Draft Plan Map Development

Step 3: Recommend facility types (what lines on the map mean)

- Updated bicycle facility types (based on underlying street classification)
- Incorporated new facility types into the plan (cycle tracks, buffered bike lanes, neighborhood greenways)



Draft Plan Map Development

Preliminary Draft Bicycle Facility Designation Criteria

Generalized Bicycle Facility Designation	Detailed Bicycle Facility Designation	Speed Limit (mph)	ADT (vehicles per day)	Street Classification
Enhanced street	Neighborhood Greenway	25 or less	1,500 or less	Non-arterial
	Shared lane pavement marking	25	To be used due to ROW constraints or downhill	Non-arterial and Collector/minor arterials
In street, minor separation	Bicycle lane	25-30	8,000 or less	Collector arterials
	Buffered bicycle lane	25-30	15,000 or less	Collector/minor arterials
In street, major separation	Cycle track (raised or with barrier)	30 and greater	15,000 and above	Minor/principal arterials
Off-street	Multi-use trail	N/A	N/A	N/A




Draft Bicycle Facilities

- Enhanced street – neighborhood greenways



- In street, minor separation – bike lanes and buffered bike lanes



- In street, major separation – cycle tracks



Draft Plan Map Development

Preliminary Draft Bicycle Facility Designation Criteria

Neighborhood greenways:

- The specific location of a neighborhood greenway may change based on more detailed analysis and design work
- Map is intended to show corridors where a greenway would be an appropriate connection



Draft Plan Map Development




Multi-Modal Corridors — (highlighted on draft map in yellow)

The map designates some areas as multi-modal corridors, based on:

- Priority transit corridors identified in the City's Transit Master Plan (TMP)
- Major Truck Streets (key freight routes)
- Need for more analysis about potential to build a bicycle facility on that street or a parallel street



Draft Plan Network Map



Street Designation	Total Miles on Network Map	Existing Facilities that Meet/Exceed Recommendations	New Facilities Recommendations	Upgrade to Existing Facility Recommended	Facilities to build
Enhanced Street	226	15	211	0	211
In Street, Minor Separation	200	43	109	48	157
In Street, Major Separation	137	0	80	57	137
Off-Street	64	46	18	0	18

Questions Asked on Draft Plan Map



1. Are there streets that are missing a bicycle facility that should have one **ADDED** and why?
2. Are there any proposed streets that do have a proposed bicycle facility that should be **REMOVED** and why?
3. Does the proposed facility designation criteria make sense?
4. Are there any concerns about the multi-modal corridor approach and the potential trade-offs that could arise?



Public Engagement Phase II

Activities (November – January)

- Three November public meetings
 - 300 attendees
 - Thousands of comments on the draft network maps
- Comment sheet and interactive mapping tool (1,400+ comments on map)
- 200+ e-mails with comments
- Attended 24 community, advisory board, and district council meetings
- Letters from organizations



What We Heard – Key Findings



- Add streets to the proposed network:
 - Address connectivity gaps (e.g. SLU to Capitol Hill) and missing connections
 - Tweaks to neighborhood greenways
 - More focus on intersections
- Remove streets from the proposed network:
 - Comments indicated concern about practicality or necessity of arterial bike facilities (e.g. NE 65th St)
 - Narrow or too steep streets
 - Some interest in removing arterial streets that have transit service



What We Heard – Key Findings

- Facility designation criteria:
 - Generally made sense; some interest in adding other criteria (transit street classifications, truck volumes, speed, etc)
 - Not all facility types are appropriate for all ages and abilities
 - Some suggestions to modify criteria
 - Make neighborhood greenways its own category
 - In street, major separation ADT threshold
- Multi-modal corridors:
 - Strong interest and conflicting public comment for many corridors



What We Heard – Key Findings



- Policy framework:
 - Generally support vision and goals
 - Connectivity is crucial to encourage more ridership
 - Interest in perceived safety
 - Interest in performance measures to track progress
- Programs:
 - Support for a variety programmatic ideas: driver's education and licensing, family/neighborhood rides, marketing the benefits of riding a bike, programs in schools, focused outreach to women



Draft Programmatic Categories



Programs to help achieve the goals: ridership, safety, connectivity, equity, livability

What We Heard – Key Findings

Other comments:

- Curious about funding strategy and maintenance of new facilities
- Negative comments about bikes in BAT lanes
- Concerns about challenging crossings and barriers
- Concern that plan map might be too ambitious
- Map needs more legibility to convey how it links core destinations together



Key Issues and Questions

- Competing demands on arterials
 - Arterials are most direct connections between Urban Villages and neighborhoods for cyclists, and have most demand for other uses (transit, freight, parking, etc.)
 - Updated facility types (cycle tracks) could be more challenging to implement (more space required than conventional bike lanes)
 - Conflicting public comments about bicycle facilities on some corridors
- “All ages and abilities” facilities
 - Comments that some facilities in the network (“in street minor separation”) may not be appropriate for all bicycle riders
 - Do all bike improvements in the network need to be appropriate for all ages and abilities?



Key Issues and Questions

- Addressing gaps in the network at intersections and crossings
 - Citywide BMP can address some major intersection improvements, and will develop an intersection design toolkit
- Interest in a “user” map, which is different from the current future network plan map
 - Current draft map is more focused on identifying locations for new bicycle investments)
- How many optional routes between destinations should the network plan map identify
 - Direct routes (arterials) and more meandering routes (greenways)?
 - Topography also a factor



How We Are Responding

- Facility designation criteria:
 - Considering updates based on comments
- Plan map refinements:
 - More analysis of feasibility of bicycle facilities on multi-modal corridors and other arterials
 - Identify parallel routes if necessary
 - Evaluating creating clearer connections of “all ages and abilities” facilities
 - Need to better research and define these types of facilities
 - Develop more specific design guidance for facilities and intersections
 - Improve map readability



BMP Update Next Steps

- Make refinements to draft map and designation criteria based on comments
- Identify programs (to enhance bicycle ridership, safety, etc.)
- Develop updated performance measures and prioritization framework
- Develop updated implementation strategies
- Develop complete draft BMP update for public review in late spring

